

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**GUERRERO SILVESTRE ALONSO, : CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:17-CV-1068**

:  
**Petitioner : (Chief Judge Conner)**

:  
**v.**

**CRAIG LOWE, et al.,**

:  
**Respondents :**

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 3rd day of October, 2017, upon consideration of the report (Doc. 7) of Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson, recommending the court deny the petition (Doc. 1) for writ of habeas corpus filed by petitioner Guerrero Silvestre Alonso (“Alonso”), and it appearing that no party has objected to the report, see FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2), and the court noting that failure of a party to timely object to a magistrate judge’s conclusions “may result in forfeiture of *de novo* review at the district court level,” Nara v. Frank, 488 F.3d 187, 194 (3d Cir. 2007) (citing Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878-79 (3d Cir. 1987)), but that, as a matter of good practice, a district court should “afford some level of review to dispositive legal issues raised by the report,” Henderson, 812 F.2d 878; see also Taylor v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec., 83 F. Supp. 3d 625, 626 (M.D. Pa. 2015) (citing Univac Dental Co. v. Dentsply Int’l, Inc., 702 F. Supp. 2d 465, 469 (M.D. Pa. 2010)), in order to “satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record,” FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b) advisory committee notes, and, following an independent review of the record, the court being in agreement with

Judge Carlson's recommendation, and concluding that there is no clear error on the face of the record,<sup>1</sup> it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The report (Doc. 7) of Magistrate Judge Carlson is ADOPTED.
2. Alonso's petition (Doc. 1) for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 is DENIED.
3. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE this case.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER

Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge  
United States District Court  
Middle District of Pennsylvania

---

<sup>1</sup> The magistrate judge's report (Doc. 7) issued July 27, 2017, before Alonso's reply brief deadline of July 28, 2017 had expired. (See Doc. 4). Alonso timely filed his reply on July 28, 2017. (Doc. 8). In reviewing the magistrate judge's report, we have considered Alonso's reply arguments and conclude that same are inapposite.